UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CIVIL ACTION NO 16-MD-2738 (FLW) (LHG)

IN RE JOHNSON & JOHNSON : TRANSCRIPT OF
POWDER PRODUCTS MARKETING, : STATUS CONFERENCE SALES PRACTICES.

: MAY 15, 2018

CLARKSON S. FISHER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 402 EAST STATE STREET, TRENTON, NJ 08608

B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE FREDA L. WOLFSON, USDJ

APPEARANCES:

BEASLEY ALLEN, ESQUIRES

BY: P. LEIGH O'DELL, ESQUIRE (ALABAMA)

-and-

ASHCRAFT & GEREL, ESQUIRES

BY: MICHELLE A. PARFITT, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

-and-

LEVIN PAPANTONIO, ESQUIRES

BY: CHRISTOPHER V. TISI, ESQUIRE (FLORIDA)

-and-

BURNS CHAREST, ESQUIRES

BY: WARREN BURNS, ESQUIRE (TEXAS)

-and-

COHEN PLACITELLA & ROTH, ESQUIRES

BY: CHRISTOPHER M. PLACITELLA, ESOUIRE (NEW JERSEY)

-and-

WILENTZ, ESQUIRES

BY: DANIEL R. LAPINSKI, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs Steering Committee

(Continued.)

VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, RPR, CRR, CCR OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER (609) 588-9516

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH, ESQUIRES
BY: SUSAN M. SHARKO, ESQUIRE
JULIE L. TERSIGNI, ESQUIRE
-and-

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, ESQUIRES BY: JOHN H. BEISNER, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON, D.C.) On behalf of Defendant Johnson & Johnson

SEYFARRTH & SHAW, ESQUIRES

BY: THOMAS L. LOCKE, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON D.C.)

-and
BARRY, McTIERNAN & WEDINGER, ESQUIRES

BY: ALEXANDRA J. TAYLOR, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)

PATRICIA S. CASAMENTO, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)
On Behalf of Defendant PCPC

TUCKER ELLIS, ESQUIRES
BY: CAROLINE M. TINSLEY, ESQUIRE (MISSOURI)
On behalf of PTI Union, LLC and PTI Royston, LLC

COUGHLIN DUFFY, ESQUIRES

BY: MARK K. SILVER, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)

-and
GORDON & REES, ESQUIRES

BY: ANN THORNTON FIELD, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)

On behalf of Defendant Imerys Talc America

CERTIFICATE

PURSUANT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C., SECTION 753, THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPT IS CERTIFIED TO BE AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

S/Vincent Russoniello
VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, CCR
OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER

3

```
4
            (In open court.)
1
 2
            THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Thank you. Everyone may be
    seated. Good morning. Sorry for the little bit of a
 4
 5
    delay this morning.
 6
            Okav.
                  Let's see where we are.
 7
            Let's talk about the agenda that you sent me
8
    which also includes one of the significant issues you
 9
    want to address today which are the competing orders
    that you have with regard to the dismissals that we
10
    spoke about on the phone for which I would hope there
11
12
    would be resolution, but apparently you reached an
13
    impasse. Is that right?
14
            MS. O'DELL: That's correct, your Honor.
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. We'll get to that in a
16
    moment.
17
            Let's look at some of the other issues that we
    have. My understanding is, first of all, with the
18
19
    sampling protocol, the issue that was initially raised
    to Judge Pisano has been resolved with that particular
20
21
    law firm, the state case. Correct?
2.2
            MS. SHARKO: Yes, your Honor. The judge in
23
    Kentucky ruled that the MDL protocol should govern
24
    which is appropriate since those lawyers were in fact
25
    signatories to it.
```

```
5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Right.
1
 2
            Now, I know that you had also said at one
 3
    point there may have been some others you were going
    to have the same issue with. Has that all gone by the
 4
 5
    wayside?
 6
            MS. O'DELL: There are no others that I'm
7
    aware of, your Honor.
8
            JUDGE WOLFSON: No others at this point.
9
    Okay.
            MS. O'DELL: That had the similar issues to
10
    what we raised in the Kentucky case.
11
12
            MS. SHARKO: We hope that remains the case.
13
            JUDGE WOLFSON: So that issue is gone.
14
            But what you are now submitting to Judge
15
    Pisano is the issue of the 30(b)(6) depositions and
16
    the contours of the areas, and I saw letters are going
    back and forth or beginning to go back and forth
17
18
    including the dates for the depositions. So that's
    before him?
19
20
            MR. TISI: Yes, your Honor.
21
            THE COURT: All right.
2.2
            It appears that the most substantial issues
23
    are those between J&J and the plaintiffs and not
24
    necessarily all in place with regard to Imerys and
    PCPC but closer. Correct?
25
```

```
6
            MR. TISI: I think that's fair, your Honor.
1
 2
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.
 3
            Now, what about third-party documents and
    motions to compel, these three nonparty witnesses?
 4
 5
            MR. TISI: Your Honor, very briefly by way of
 6
    background --
 7
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I read the letter.
8
            MR. TISI: So really where we are is, what we
    learned is that two of the witnesses have in fact been
 9
    served. It was our assumption based upon
10
    conversations I had when we were negotiating the
11
12
    contours of the actual notice of the deposition itself
    and the subpoena, it was our understanding that
13
    because each of these witnesses had been in fact
14
15
    retained as litigation consultants and/or experts by
    the defendants, that they would pull communications
16
17
    that they had, each of the witnesses had with whatever
    the retaining defendant would be and that they would
18
    be returned to us.
19
20
            It is my understanding, although I guess we
21
    need some clarification, that the defendants currently
    have the documents from these three witnesses.
2.2
23
    they do, we would ask that you would compel their
24
    production at this point because we don't have them.
25
    But assuming that they don't have them, we would like
```

```
to have an order compelling two of the witnesses who
1
 2
    we know have in fact been served.
 3
            We have done on one of the witnesses, Dr.
    Muscat, we have some -- there was some confusion.
 4
 5
    We've tried to clarify that before today's hearing.
    If not we will get him served right away. But we
 6
 7
    would like to have his documents as well. All three
    of them are scientists or involved in the
8
 9
    science-related issues that we are litigating right
10
    now.
11
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I thought in reading the
12
    letter you are willing to working to get these
    documents.
13
            MR. TISI: Well, your Honor --
14
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Let Ms. Sharko respond for
    herself.
16
17
            MS. SHARKO: Thank you.
            So some seven months ago we negotiated the
18
    form of the subpoena with the plaintiffs. We heard
19
20
    nothing. Then in the last week they said: Where are
21
    the documents?
            We were not aware as to whether or not there
2.2
23
    had been service or not. So within the last couple of
24
    days Mr. Tisi sent us what purports to be proof of
25
    service. It was not filed as the local rules require.
```

2.2

We're looking at what they say is proof of service. I'm not sure that these witnesses have in fact been served or that that is valid service. So we need to figure that out.

Once that's figured out, I will let him know our position and if they haven't been validly served the plaintiffs can then serve them. Once they are served then we will want to review the documents first.

I agree with that much. But we are not there yet, and it would be premature to enter any kind of order at this point.

MR. TISI: Well, your Honor, we do have affidavits of service for two of the witnesses. In fact, I'm holding them in my hand right now. The fact that they were not apparently served under the local rules doesn't affect the service of it. We'll file it administratively with the Court.

They were served late last year, both Dr.

Bailey and, Dr. Hunchareck were served. I have the affidavits. We can provide them. So there is no need to go back and re-serve them.

It was my expectation and the reason why this got held up was because there had been those discussions that they would go to the defendants, at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
least they would review them for the purposes of --
our agreement was that communications with counsel
would be pulled, litigation counsel to be clear. They
were very much involved even up until today on the
regulatory and science issues, and even up until today
we would like to get those documents.
        So I have those two. If the Court would
agree, I think we would like to be able to get those
documents immediately and we would like to be able to
get an order compelling at least those two and we will
find out what is remaining with respect to Dr. Muscat.
        JUDGE WOLFSON: I don't know that you need an
order. We do operate under meet and confer here.
        So first I think there was the issue whether
there was service. You have to show them there was
service. I think the indication is if there has been
service you are going to move ahead. Right?
       MS. SHARKO: Right. And I'm not convinced
that there's been valid service, but we'll look at
that and we'll work it out.
        JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, how were they served?
       MR. TISI: They were served by process server.
I have the affidavits. In fact, I gave them to Ms.
Sharko last week.
```

MS. SHARKO: So what we were given last week

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

10

were statements about serving a representative. was no personal service. I think Rule 45 requires for an individual personal service. JUDGE WOLFSON: Where were they served, at their home or --MR. TISI: They were served at their home. JUDGE WOLFSON: If it's at home, it's any adult over the age of 18 can accept service. MS. SHARKO: It wasn't at home. But we're trying to find the people and we're looking at the law and either service was valid or it wasn't. If we believe it wasn't, we'll tell Mr. Tisi and I assume that he will get the people served. I don't know why we haven't heard anything on this for seven months. MR. TISI: These are experts that they have as well. They aren't people who are just incidental. These are retained witnesses by the defendants. They have some control and custody over these witnesses. It's silly to us. I have been under the impression that these documents had been reviewed. In fact, I had spoken to Imerys' counsel. Wе had been working collaboratively on getting these

materials. I thought they were in the process of being produced. When I emailed counsel about it, I had no idea these were not what we thought they were.

```
These are witnesses that have been retained by the
1
 2
    defendants.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Are they retained by you
    currently?
 4
 5
            MS. SHARKO: I don't know the answer to that.
 6
            MR. TISI: I have an email from counsel saying
7
    that they are.
            MS. SHARKO: But it's not an issue that we
8
    are -- now that the issue has been raised and he has
 9
    asked, we will facilitate the document production.
10
    But I think service is important and there may or may
11
12
    not be an issue. We just need to figure that out.
13
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Look, let's be real.
                                                   They may
    be third parties. On the other hand, if ultimately
14
15
    they are your retained consulting experts, even if
16
    they are not going to issue reports, to some extent I
17
    would think that you might even prefer if you could
    agree with these experts to accept service.
18
            We don't want to go around the block on this.
19
    They are not strangers to the litigation if they are
20
21
    your consulting experts. I don't know why it's
2.2
    becoming so difficult. I would prefer to see some
23
    cooperation.
```

Unless what you are telling me if these consulting experts that you are paying, unless that's

24

25

```
not the case that you have retained have said to you,
1
 2
    We refuse you to let you accept service and they have
 3
    to serve us personally and they haven't done so, if
    that's the case, good, let them know that.
 4
 5
            But if it's not, let's get real, please, Ms.
 6
    Sharko, and I'll say that to Imerys counsel, too.
 7
    don't know if you are standing on ceremony about
8
    service or not. I don't know who controls these
    people. I don't know if it's jointly because you are
 9
    saying Imerys. You are saying J&J. Are they your
10
    people?
11
12
            MS. SHARKO: Mr. Tisi, I understand what you
13
    are saying and we will cooperate as always. But Mr.
    Tisi raised this for the first time within the last
14
15
    couple of days. It's that silence --
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I don't need the tit for tat.
16
17
    You may say it wasn't raised recently. I'm putting
    out there on the table today that I don't want to see
18
19
    it.
            MS. SHARKO: I understand.
20
21
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I think this is wasting our
2.2
    time and expense and there is no reason for it. Let's
23
    move on.
24
            MR. TISI: Thank you, your Honor.
25
            JUDGE WOLFSON: You wanted to speak.
```

```
13
1
    sorry.
 2
            MR. SILVER: That's all right, your Honor.
                                                         Wе
 3
    moved on.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: That's probably a good move.
 4
            MS. SHARKO: I would just ask, if there are
 5
    any other subpoenas out there where they have served
 6
7
    and they haven't file proof of service or told us
8
    that, just let us know so we know what's out there.
 9
            MR. TISI: I have no problem with that, your
    Honor. With the administrative thing we thought it
10
    was filed and it had not been.
11
12
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.
13
            Then you have privilege issues that are being
14
    presented to Judge Pisano with regard to Imerys.
15
            MR. BURNS:
                        That's correct, your Honor.
16
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. That's his thing then.
17
    All right.
18
            The samples and testing which I had brought up
    initially, my understanding therefore is the testing
19
20
    has begun and plaintiffs are saying that they expect
21
    120 days. Defendants say it's too long. So you've
2.2
    had them for about a month and a half, March 27th?
23
            MS. O'DELL: March 27th we got some J&J
24
    samples, and from Imerys on April the 10th.
25
```

Your Honor, we had suggested that we need

1 | 120 days which would take us to September 15th.

That's 115 working days for this lab. I want to describe to you the process, your Honor, to do the testing that's required.

JUDGE WOLFSON: You people picked the lab. Is that what the lab is saying, they require this time?

I want to know where it's coming from, how you came up with the time.

MS. O'DELL: Let me start by saying, we have 135 samples to test. The lab, the expert lab is Dr. Bill Longo's lab. It's Materials Analytical Services. He's the premier lab in the country. The testing that will be done on these samples involve TEM testing, transmission electron microscopy testing.

To prepare the samples it takes 14 hours per sample to do the actual analysis of the sample for TEM and then for what they call EXRD. If you find fibers such as asbestos, it requires 15 to 21 hours for a total of 29 to 35 hours per sample.

And what Dr. Longo and his team have told us is that for the sample preparation that can be sped up, if you will, because you have multiple technicians preparing samples. But when it comes down to the analysis, the TEM analysis, it takes 15 to 21 hours. That variance is because of what they find.

2.2

Now, if they find a certain number of bundles it takes longer for them to document that. When I mean "bundles," your Honor, I'm talking about asbestos fibers. So that process has a very specific timeframe. So as soon as they got the samples they began to work. They have been working diligently.

But Dr. Longo has conveyed to me as recently as last night to confirm that he needs 120 days to accomplish the testing using the methodology that he has testified to across the country. He's been accepted on Daubert on this methodology. His methodology has been published in the literature.

So we feel it's very critical that we do this correctly because as Ms. Sharko pointed out the MDL protocol controls and it controls not only for ovarian cancer cases within the MDL, but it's going to control for state ovarian cancer cases, for state mesothelioma cases, and your Honor not for just cases that are pending now but cases in the future because as Ms. Sharko has raised several times there is a finite amount of material. This is an opportunity to do the testing and there will be most likely limited testing done on these particular samples in the future.

So that's what we're dealing with, your Honor.

Dr. Longo has indicated this is the time needed and

2.2

that's why we've requested it. We feel like this is very important that we have, one, the premier lab in the country do it, that we have this number of samples tested because it's representative across not only the products, both Baby Powder and Shower To Shower but also across the time period which goes from the '60s through the present across defendant because we had samples from Imerys and also samples from J&J and also across the mines from which the talcum powder was sourced.

So there are a lot of things that we have to cover to ensure there is representative testing.

That's what we've tried to do. That's the timeframe for Dr. Longo and his team. I have been to his lab.

It's a state of the art facility with many scientists there. They are working very hard. We have pressed them to do it as quickly as possible and this is the timeframe that's been given to us.

MS. SHARKO: So here's what's so frustrating.

I acknowledge --

JUDGE WOLFSON: Because you want your Daubert hearing. I know it's frustrating, Ms. Sharko.

MS. SHARKO: Right. But Dr. Longo is the plaintiffs' go-to expert for this. He is involved in all of the asbestos cases for these same plaintiffs.

2.2

And while we sit at the station waiting for our

Daubert hearing these same lawyers continue to prepare

and try cases across the country in state court. The

Lanier firm assisted by Ashcroft & Gerel and Cohen

Placitella and all these other firms has a 23

plaintiff ovarian cancer case with Dr. Longo as an

expert set to go in Missouri on June 2nd or 4th.

That's followed by by another multi-plaintiff case in St. Louis with the Beasley Allen firm and other firms backed up behind it called the Forest case, and there is another case where discovery is progressing, set for trial behind that in St. Louis, another ovarian cancer case with these same lawyers. Then they have a case against PTI, the Beasley Allen firm, that they are pressing for a trial date in St. Louis County. Those are just the ovarian cases.

Then we get to the asbestos/talc cases around the country. There is one being tried right now in California. There are others with trial dates. There was one that was tried up in New Brunswick again with Dr. Longo as an expert.

So all these cases are moving forward and we are still here and that is what is frustrating about it. If we wait until September for this testing to be completed, we are not going to see a Daubert hearing

2.2

for a year. I hope that's not true, but that's the reality of it. So if Dr. Longo can be doing all this testing for St. Louis and St. Louis and St. Louis and California, the MDL should be a priority.

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, there are so many things that I disagree with about what Ms. Sharko just said. Let me just start with a few things.

Dr. Longo has testified in recent trials and he testified in relation to testing of samples that are distinct and different from the samples that have been produced in the MDL. So that testing is ongoing right now.

I expect Dr. Longo will testify in the

June 4th trial in St. Louis with the Linear firm.

Ms. Parfitt is not involved in that case. For the

Beasley Allen cases Dr. Longo has not been retained in
those cases. So to the degree there was some

suggestion that that was the case, that's not because
we don't think he is a great witness. He just did not
happen to be in those cases.

So the point being, your Honor, we have the task before us to test the samples that have been essentially lodged within your jurisdiction. They have not been made available in other cases. And so we have the responsibility to do the testing with the

methodology that is accepted in the scientific community and that's what we're doing.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I'm not concerned about the testing itself. The real question is, I know he said 120 days. It's already started.

MS. O'DELL: Yes.

pointed out, there are going to be multiple technicians that are perhaps doing this at the same time. So my real question would be -- I'm going to let it be the amount of time that's really necessary. Of course, I don't have any kind of declaration from Dr. Longo as to all of this. I accept what you've said he has told you.

But the question is: Is there any way to save some time on this? I don't think we're going to save a lot. I don't think it's going to be less than 90 days. But can we work with 90 as opposed to 120? I'm just asking these questions and I would like to get some more information.

I'm going to let it be done and I'm going to let it be done correctly. I appreciate the estimates you are given me on the amount of man hours involved for each of these samples. But I also don't know how many people are in this lab and how many people are

2.2

going to be doing it at the same time. So I'm a little bit at a loss and I understand you are getting whatever information he's providing to you.

This is the testing lab you are using. I guess you people are not involved with it?

MS. SHARKO: No, not at all.

JUDGE WOLFSON: So you don't have any of these same discussions with Dr. Longo. That's all on the plaintiffs' end only. All right.

I would like to work with something shorter than 120 days. I'm going to be reasonable about it. I would like to see if you could go back and shorten it to 90 and you are going to let us know and then I'll work from those dates.

I think this also goes back to obviously dates that we set previously or that Judge Pisano was setting previously were all being triggered by when the sample work was done, which he believed to be in July. You are now suggesting September. Maybe we can get it to be mid-August, if we could move it up a little bit, but that's going to affect all the trigger dates.

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, I'm happy to come back in June and report to you further. We have really pressed him to do this as quickly as possible.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.

2.2

MS. O'DELL: We understand that as soon as it's finished that we have a duty to inform the Court it's finished so the 45 days are gone. So we are working very diligently toward that end and we will definitely report back to Dr. Longo and say we need it as quickly as possible and if you can do it less than 120 days please do that and let us know.

I just want to say for the record, your Honor, when Judge Pisano laid out the facts in the letter of February 6th, at that point in time we really didn't know the number of samples involved and a lot of the information now that we are really in the thick of it, if you will, in terms of testing.

Thank you.

JUDGE WOLFSON: In the end we are quibbling about it but there are always delays. If I'm saying 90 versus 120, we are only the talking 30 days. But then I know the next date that will be come there will be some reason why that is going to be extended. We know the trickle down effect every time there is some delay or extension. We're trying to avoid that.

So if we can get this done a little more quickly that would be great. You are going to let me know. And obviously I can't set a Daubert hearing

until I have these exact dates. So there we are.

Look, I would like to get it done as well.

2.2

Now, let's turn to these dismissals. We had discussion in a conference call and I hoped there would be resolution and there hasn't been. I have been given competing orders here from defense counsel and last night I was given the proposed orders from plaintiffs' counsel sometime yesterday.

Obviously, the real dispute here is, these are the cases for which the plaintiffs wanted to dismiss their actions, whether it's because they did not actually have ovarian cancer and I don't know what the other reasons are. We talked about that on the phone. I don't know if there are other reasons they want it dismissed.

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, can I speak to that so you know what's before you?

JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes.

MS. O'DELL: We reached out to each of the counsel for plaintiffs in the list of cases. There are 14 cases listed. In 12 instances the plaintiffs' cancer did not meet the criteria for which the Plaintiffs Steering Committee is producing expert reports. So they are outside at the criteria, if you will. So that's 12 of the 14. Two involve plaintiffs

2.2

who died and their heirs whether that's the husband or remaining children for whatever reason do not feel that they can move forward with the case. So this is not a situation where it was suggested in the joint status report that plaintiffs are, quote, jumping ship.

In each instance there has been a very legitimate reason that the plaintiff has sought to dismiss without prejudice. And from our perspective, your Honor, plaintiffs are often criticized for filing cases that don't meet the criteria of the particular litigation and causing the docket to be populated by cases that aren't appropriate. In these instances the firms have chosen to try to clean it up themselves and I think that's a good thing.

MS. SHARKO: I can make this really easy. If there is only 12 cases and those are the reasons they want to dismiss, why don't we just work it out individually. I think that is the way our stipulation is drafted. The conditions about re-filing should work with those cases.

That's what we have done with other cases in the past and rather than try and have this global form of order -- and I can go through the plaintiffs paragraph by paragraph, but I won't at this point. If

2.2

it's just those 12 cases and they don't have ovarian cancer or they died and don't want to proceed, let's just do it case-by-case.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, they want to know what is the term that you are going to include. Because I guess for the ones who have died and they don't want to proceed, if at some point, let's say, six months from now they decide they want to proceed, what happens?

And similarly for those 12 who don't fit the criteria, as you say, what you are leaving open is at some point in time if in fact they develop this kind of cancer, they are going to want to file a new case.

So we still have to deal with what happens upon a re-filing if someone's mind has changed and the Statute of Limitations does not run on it. So I still have to resolve it. It doesn't have to be, as you say, in the form of a global order, but you have to decide what's going in it, and you are still going to have this issue when you leave me today is what I'm going to say.

MS. SHARKO: I think it's pretty simple. If they change their mind or they develop ovarian cancer in the future, they re-file here in the MDL. We are going to be here for a while. And if we are not here,

they can file in their home state or New Jersey.

JUDGE WOLFSON: You don't care if they file in their home state.

MS. O'DELL: I don't. But, your Honor, they are not limited to that. And when Ms. Sharko says "it's pretty simple" it's just not the law in the District of New Jersey where there's not been substantial progress in a case where there would be no difference in the cost of a second lawsuit --

JUDGE WOLFSON: I'm trying to figure out:
What other jurisdiction do you want? She's now
saying, go ahead, file in your home state or file in
the MDL. What else are you looking for?

MS. O'DELL: Well, in our proposed order we laid out the other appropriate jurisdictions for purposes of filing. It would be certainly the home state or resident state of the plaintiff. It would be the states in which they had their primary usage.

In other words, they lived in New Jersey for 30 years and then moved to Florida. They arguably could file in New Jersey. It would also be the place where they are diagnosed or treated for the cancer. Or, lastly, and not to be forgotten, the resident states of the defendants which in this instance could be New Jersey for J&J, it could be California, or

2.2

Delaware for Imerys, it could be D.C. for PCPC for that matter, and there may be a time in the future, your Honor, where there are other defendants that are appropriate and you could file within those states.

The proposed order that was put forth by the Johnson & Johnson defendants precluded a plaintiff in the future from adding a defendant. How is that appropriate?

JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, that's not appropriate.

I'm not going to direct that be done. That's not happening.

But I do understand your concern was you are worried about at some point fraudulent joinder, that they are joining someone that you're claiming shouldn't have been. But if they have a legitimate defendant to join, they're permitted to joinder. So I can't say here today that you can't ever join a defendant.

What we're really talking about is clearly setting up for -- defendants would like finality. If you define three jurisdictions it makes it easy. Everybody knows where you can go. Plaintiffs are suggesting that there are others that could be appropriate. Defendants may not agree that they are appropriate.

2.2

What you are trying to avoid is motion practice at some later date to say: That is not an propose jurisdiction. Right?

MS. SHARKO: Exactly. We don't agree that where you used the product, where you were diagnosed, et cetera, we don't agree that there is jurisdiction there.

JUDGE WOLFSON: But you preserve your rights and it's limited. The better language is, if we just leave it as opposed to you defining where substantially used, where diagnosed, if you simply make it as they can re-file in the MDL, they can re-file in their home state or wherever, there would be jurisdiction over the defendants named. It leaves open your defenses to argue it's the wrong jurisdiction and you file where you want and you can decide.

MR. SILVER: Judge, the other problem with plaintiffs' proposed order as I'm reading it now is, I take Ms. O'Dell at her word, but the 12 cases that she's talking about she's checked those out. This is a blanket order that essentially allows plaintiffs to dismiss without prejudice and essentially forum shop anywhere.

JUDGE WOLFSON: We're not going to do it. I

2.2

agree with Ms. Sharko's suggestion that it's a limited universe. I thought there were going to be a lot more cases.

We'll just do a separate order in each of the cases that has the parameters I just outlined in that way for that particular case and for these 14 cases only at this point and you'll deal with other ones if they come up.

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, when you said appropriate jurisdiction for the defendant, if I could just raise again the issue of the circumstance where a plaintiff has substantial use in a particular state. They lived there for a period of time. They moved. That would be a location where jurisdiction would be appropriate because the tort, if you will, has occurred and --

JUDGE WOLFSON: That's fine except that the reason I don't want to deal with that is you'll have a dispute over what "substantial" means and you'll say:
We were allowed to do this because this was substantial. Does substantial mean two years? Does substantial mean 20 years?

So when you start adding those things you are just creating more disputes. That's why I said:

Let's just leave it at jurisdiction for which there

```
would be jurisdiction over the defendants. We're
1
 2
    looking at specific jurisdiction in those cases and
 3
    we'll have to analyze: Is that an appropriate
    jurisdiction? Because I don't want to define
 4
    "substantial" now and we're not going to do that.
 5
            It's easier to know the ones that are not
 6
 7
    disputed are the home state of the plaintiff, the MDL,
8
    home state of defendant, and leave open any other
 9
    jurisdiction where there could be jurisdiction
    asserted and you can argue at a later point. I don't
10
    want to get into what substantial means today.
11
12
            So don't conclude that one. Let's have simple
13
    orders now that deal with this. Right?
            MS. SHARKO: Right, in those individual cases.
14
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: In the individual 14 cases.
            So that's for those issues.
16
17
            So who is going to draft that?
            MS. O'DELL: I will be happy to do it, your
18
19
    Honor.
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: She got up first. It's like
    Jeopardy. She rang the bell first.
21
2.2
            Do I need to deal with at all PCPC, Item No.
    4, the dismissals?
23
24
            MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, I had an opportunity
25
    to speak with Mr. Locke this morning and we're going
```

2.2

to work that out. We just need to reconcile the cases that PCPC believe are appropriate for dismissal.

It's not an issue with regard to the context of the order. It's just the cases and we just need to make sure there is a reconciliation and don't dismiss cases that wouldn't be appropriate. So he and I talked and we'll work it out and report back to the Court. There should be no problem.

Similarly, with regard to the amendment issue, that's Roman numeral IV, I have spoken to counsel for J&J and we will look at those 55 cases to find out whether or not pursuant to Rule 15, those cases have been -- whether there needed to be a motion or not. The contention here from the plaintiffs is that many of those may not have required a motion that there was the right under Rule 15 to amend post a responsive pleading.

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} So\ I\ think\ we\ can\ work\ out\ Roman\ numeral\ IV \\ and\ Roman\ numeral\ V\ without\ need\ of\ the\ Court\ at\ this \\ point. \end{tabular}$

JUDGE WOLFSON: And No. VI?

MS. O'DELL: Related to cases, your Honor, where there has been a short form complaint filed under CMO 8, but not a notice of filing a short form complaint in the master docket. The number there is

104 and Mr. Signy kindly provided a list of those now. 1 2 So we can go through those and reconcile the 3 list. I know for the Beasley Allen cases, for example, we have filed the notices and we just need to 4 do a reconciliation to get down to the filing number. 5 It shouldn't be a problem. 6 7 With respect to the 331 cases that are listed 8 here where defendants have stated that a short form 9 complaint has not been filed, Mr. Beisner and Mr. Silver and I have been working on an agreement to 10 address plaintiffs that were transferred into the MDL 11 12 in multi-plaintiff complaints who were residents of 13 either New Jersey, California or Delaware, and for which there would not be federal subject matter 14 15 jurisdiction. 16 We've reached an agreement on that. 17 believe that most of those 331 plaintiffs are from those states. We'll take care of those and then get 18 19 down to what may be some others that we can take a 20 look at. 21 JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. 2.2 These duplicate cases, you are still working 23 on that. There is 73 of those. Right? 24 MS. O'DELL: Yes, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I think that's basically your

25

```
32
    agendas items. Correct?
1
 2
            MS. O'DELL: Yes.
 3
            MS. SHARKO: Yes.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I wanted to address just
 4
    briefly -- I'll give as one example -- one of the
 5
    remand and motion to dismiss motions involving Imerys.
 6
 7
    I'll give as an example Edna Brown which is docket No.
8
    17 - 5724.
            I don't know if you were ready for this or not
 9
    today. I'm not looking for oral argument because I
10
    understand you were not set for this today, but I want
11
12
    to tell you some concerns. I guess the Miller firm
13
    responded to that motion.
14
            MS. O'DELL: I'm not aware, your Honor.
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Well, the opposition brief was
16
    from the Miller firm. Nobody is here from the Miller
    firm?
17
18
            MS. PARFITT: No, your Honor. I don't believe
19
    so.
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I guess you can take a message
21
    back. What I had here is, this is one where they've
22
    named J&J, Walgreens and Imerys and have argued that
    because they named the local Walgreens claiming that
23
24
    there was not diversity, it should be remanded naming
25
    the retailer, and Imerys has filed a motion to dismiss
```

for lack of personal jurisdiction in Illinois. 1 2 Does this sound familiar to you at all? 3 MR. SILVER: I recognize the case, your Honor, and once you tell me the jurisdiction I know what the 4 argument is. 5 JUDGE WOLFSON: Illinois. 6 7 MR. SILVER: Yes. 8 JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. So there is no general 9 jurisdiction and the focus obviously is going to be specific jurisdiction. But I want to tell you what my 10 concern is and what's given me some pause, and there 11 12 is argument back and forth and do I decide the motion to dismiss first? Do I decide the remand first? 1.3 14 there is discretion in the court depending on which is 15 the easier question to answer. 16 One of the things that's being argued here, 17 put aside the stream of commerce argument that the plaintiff tries to make with regard to Illinois, but 18 what they focus on as well is this conspiracy theory. 19 20 Do you recall this? 21 MR. SILVER: I do, your Honor. 2.2 JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. And the notion that

J&J, Imerys and Walgreens conspired to hide or conceal information, and specifically that J&J and Imerys were members of the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance

23

24

25

2.2

Association and formed the Talc Interested Party Task Force and go on about hiding or deleting information from them.

I'm not getting into the real merits. But what I wanted to point out, first of all, is in your reply brief you didn't address the conspiracy theory. Of course the conspiracy theory doesn't also specifically address activity directed at Illinois. But the bottom line is, I probably will need to talk to the parties because the briefing really is inadequate to address the issues.

Moreover, you can take back to the Miller firm that the complaint on which they rely and argue about this notion of conspiring and that this is still a conspiracy theory that involves, quote, all defendants, it's very lose language in the brief because the brief suggests -- this is just highlighting, so when you come in you know what I'm going to want to talk about.

The brief suggests that the allegations are that the three of you conspired, J&J, Walgreens and Imerys, to keep this information and do certain actions with the Task Force, et cetera. But there is no allegation in the complaint that Walgreens was part of that group.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So I don't even know how they could argue that it was part of it, but loosely in the briefing it suggests that. Of course, you haven't addressed the conspiracy theory so you didn't address that point. But the briefing, for instance, says -- I don't even know that we need to be on the record for this. giving everyone highlights of the problems that I'm having. Let me get out the language in the brief. MR. PLACITELLA: Your Honor, can we stay on the record because we're going to have to hand this to somebody. JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. I understand. It says on page 9 of the brief: "Here plaintiff alleges that J&J, Imerys and Walgreens knowingly agreed, contrived, combined, confederated and conspired among themselves to cause consumer injuries," and it goes on. This is the line. It says in the brief on page 10: "On July 27, 2005, J&J, Imerys and Walgreens as part of the TIPTF corresponded and agreed to edit and delete portions of scientific papers being submitted on their behalf to the United States Toxicology Program in an attempt to prevent talc from being classified as a carcinogen, and Imerys and

Walgreens through the TIPTF collectively agreed to release false information to the public."

I am not seeing in the complaint where Walgreens was involved in these groups to make them part of those allegations, apart from the fact of whether it was targeted to Illinois as opposed to anywhere else.

You see the problems I'm having. Of course, if Imerys had briefed that they would have pointed out all those problems in their reply, but here we are. But the question also is, if I find that there is no jurisdiction over Imerys, do these plaintiffs still not want to stay in the MDL? You've got Walgreens out there. But I got to tell you, the allegations as they have been against Walgreens isn't going to really fly here.

What I'm really saying is, I've got to deal with the jurisdiction question I guess over Imerys. I want to know really what this Miller firm wants to do and I don't want to waste my time.

MS. O'DELL: We'll convey that to them, your Honor, and certainly provide the transcript.

JUDGE WOLFSON: And if we need to pursue it, it might be easier just to bring everybody in and do it on the record. I'll just do the motion.

2.2

MR. SILVER: Judge, we can do something on briefing. But if the plaintiffs want to amend their complaint, and they don't want to take time to do the briefing --

JUDGE WOLFSON: I think what you should do is talk to them. Bottom line is I still don't see -first of all, and you can have this on the record too, the stream of commerce idea, putting something in the stream of commerce we know that's out the window on personal jurisdiction for specific jurisdiction. It just is. Just the fact you put something in the stream of commerce doesn't mean you directed it to Illinois. That's not going to fly.

So the only thing they are arguing now really that's different is conspiracy. But I don't see any argument where that conspiracy is directed to Illinois, that they conspired in Illinois because there aren't any allegations about them really conspiring in Illinois. I don't want to waste my time.

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, we'll convey it to them. I'm hesitant to say anything.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Don't, and I'm not going to put you on the spot. I don't think you should speak for someone else, but that's where we are.

```
Case 3:16-md-02738-MAS-RLS Document 6191 Filed 05/22/18 Page 38 of 53 PageID: 17265
                                                                   38
                   So it might be easier if you talk to the
       1
        2
           Miller firm and if you could see where we are -- you
           want to stay in the MDL?
        3
                   MR. SILVER: Yes.
        4
        5
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: You want to stay in the MDL --
        6
                   MR. SILVER: Yes.
       7
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: -- then we don't have to worry
       8
           about the other things, jurisdiction, remand,
       9
           et cetera.
                   MR. SILVER: We will also reach out to the
       10
           Miller firm and if we need the Court's assistance we
      11
      12
           will let you know.
      13
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: Why don't you speak with them.
           That's what I wanted to highlight. Trying to go
       14
      15
           through these one by one on these remands, that's one
           of the issues I had here.
      16
       17
                   Any other issues you want to address with me
           today?
      18
                   MS. SHARKO: I'm happy to report Mr. Lapinski
       19
           and I worked out the deposition protocol order and
      20
      21
           we'll present it to your Honor for signature.
       2.2
                   MR. LAPINSKI: Not everything has to be
      23
           contentious, your Honor.
       24
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: I like it. That's excellent.
```

I think our next date was June 28th, but I may

25

```
have a problem on that date. The date after that is
1
 2
    July 25th, I believe.
 3
            Is there any other day, either the 26th or
    27th? Neither of those dates work?
 4
 5
            MS. SHARKO: No.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: And then the next week is the
 6
7
    4th of July week. I don't know that anybody wants to
8
    come in that week, and then we're coming back three
    weeks later.
9
            MS. SHARKO: What about the week of June 18th?
10
11
            JUDGE WOLFSON: No. I'm out of the country.
12
    June was a tight month for me because I have a
13
    conference and vacation plans. That's why that last
14
    week was the only week that worked really well other
15
    than the early part of the month and that's too early
    to come in after we've just been here.
16
            MS. SHARKO: How about the 29th?
17
18
            JUDGE WOLFSON: The 28th and 29th are both
19
    problems for me.
20
            MS. O'DELL: What about moving the July
21
    conference up in the month, maybe the week of the 9th
2.2
    or the 16th and we could take care of both at the same
23
    time?
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I can do that. I can move you
24
25
    in to early July.
```

```
40
            MS. SHARKO: I'm on vacation those weeks.
1
 2
            JUDGE WOLFSON: When do you come back?
 3
            MS. SHARKO: I come back the evening of
    July 23rd.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: That's why we did the 25th.
 6
    You are away the week of the 9th and the 16th?
7
            MS. SHARKO: Yes.
8
            JUDGE WOLFSON: How about the 6th? That's the
9
    July 4th week.
            MS. SHARKO: I can do the morning of the 9th.
10
    We don't leave until later in the day.
11
12
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Are you sure?
13
            MS. SHARKO: Yes.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: The 9th is good for me.
14
15
            MS. PARFITT: I can make the 9th.
            MS. O'DELL: The 9th is fine.
16
17
            JUDGE WOLFSON: So July 9th. Take off the
    28th of June and take off July 25th and we're going to
18
    meet on the 9th.
19
20
            Do you want to pick a date in August while
21
    we're here now? Now, we'll work off the fact you are
2.2
    coming on the 9th. We can do the week of the 6th, the
23
    week of the 13th.
24
            MS. PARFITT: With regard to July 9th, what
25
    time of day is that? I might be flying in that
```

```
41
    morning. That's all I'm wondering.
1
 2
            JUDGE WOLFSON: We'll do 10:30 on the 9th.
 3
    You are fine with that. Right?
            MS. SHARKO: Yes, 10:30 is okay.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: What about the week of
    August 6th or the week of August 13th? Any good or
 6
7
    bad days?
8
            MS. SHARKO: I'm away August 10th and then the
9
    following week.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: We can do the 7th, 8th or 9th
10
11
    of that week. Is that okay?
            MS. SHARKO: Yes.
12
13
            MS. O'DELL: What was that, your Honor?
            JUDGE WOLFSON: August 7th, 8th or 9th?
14
15
            MS. O'DELL: The 9th would be preferred for me
16
    and my co-counsel.
17
            I'm jealous of Ms. Sharko's vacation schedule.
18
            MS. SHARKO: Well, in August I'm driving my
    daughter to graduate school in Utah. There should be
19
20
    room in the back of the van.
21
            JUDGE WOLFSON: That's no vacation from my
22
    perspective.
23
            MS. SHARKO: There are a lot of good stops in
24
    North Dakota.
25
           MS. O'DELL: I like North Dakota.
```

```
Case 3:16-md-02738-MAS-RLS Document 6191 Filed 05/22/18 Page 42 of 53 PageID: 17269
                                                                  42
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: Does the 9th work?
       1
       2
                   MS. SHARKO: Would it be possible to do it
       3
           earlier in the week?
                   MR. SILVER: Imerys has a problem with that
       4
           week. National counsel is not available that week.
       5
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: How about the week of the
       6
       7
           13th? No days work?
       8
                   MS. SHARKO: The 23rd or 24th of August?
       9
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: And you are off the entire
           week of the 13th. Is that correct?
      10
      11
                   MS. SHARKO: Yes. How about August 1st, 2nd
      12
           or 3rd?
      13
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: No. I'm not here.
                   I could do the week of the 23rd or 24th.
      14
      15
           you'll have to send everything to my courtroom deputy.
      16
           Wayne is going to be out, so he can't forward anything
      17
           to me. That's the problem. I will be missing my help
           that week. He's gone.
      18
                   MS. O'DELL: So the 23rd. Is that the date?
      19
      20
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: Or the 22nd. It doesn't
      21
           matter.
                   MS. O'DELL: Either one is fine with us.
      2.2
      23
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: The 22nd?
```

24 MS. SHARKO: Can we do the 23rd? 25 JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes, I could do the 23rd, at

```
43
    10:30.
1
 2
            All right. August 23rd at 10:30 and July 9th
3
    at 10:30. Those are our next dates. If something
    comes up in the interim you get in touch with me.
 4
5
    That's it. You'll go work with Judge Pisano.
            You are going to let me know about the testing
 6
7
    and whether that can be done any sooner. Correct?
8
            MS. O'DELL: Yes, your Honor.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I guess that's it, if you
9
    don't have anything else.
10
11
            Thank you.
12
            THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
13
            (Proceedings concluded.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

Vincent

I, Vincent Russoniello, Official United States

Court Reporter and Certified Court Reporter of the

State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the

foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the

proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me

at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set

forth.

I do further certify that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in this action.

S/Vincent Russoniello
Vincent Russoniello, CCR
Certificate No. 675

Λ	ㄷ

			4.
,	39:4	42:1, 43:2	18:16, 31:3
	28 [1] - 3:9	, - -	ALLEN [1] - 1:13
'60s [1] - 16:6	28th [3] - 38:25, 39:18,	Α	allowed [1] - 28:20
	40:18		allows [1] - 27:22
0	29 [1] - 14:19	able [2] - 9:8, 9:9	amend [2] - 30:16, 37:2
08608 [1] - 1:8	29th [2] - 39:17, 39:18	ABOVE [1] - 3:12	amendment [1] - 30:9
1.0	2nd [2] - 17:7, 42:11	ABOVE-ENTITLED [1] -	America [1] - 2:18
1	ZIIG [2] - 17.7, 42.11	3:12	amount [3] - 15:21,
	3	accept [4] - 10:8, 11:18,	19:11, 19:23
10 [1] - 35:19		12:2, 19:13	AN [1] - 3:10
104 [1] - 31:1	30 [2] - 21:18, 25:20	accepted [2] - 15:11,	
10:30 [5] - 41:2, 41:4,	30(b)(6 [1] - 5:15	19:1	analysis [3] - 14:16,
43:1, 43:2, 43:3	331 [2] - 31:7, 31:17	accomplish [1] - 15:9	14:24
10th [2] - 13:24, 41:8	35 [1] - 14:19	accurate [1] - 44:8	Analytical [1] - 14:11
115 [1] - 14:2	3rd [1] - 42:12	ACCURATE [1] - 3:10	analyze [1] - 29:3
12 [6] - 22:21, 22:25,		acknowledge [1] - 16:20	ANN [1] - 2:18
23:17, 24:1, 24:10,	4	action [2] - 44:14, 44:16	answer [2] - 11:5, 33:15
27:20	4 [1] - 29:23	ACTION [1] - 1:2	apart [1] - 36:5
120 [8] - 13:21, 14:1,	402 [1] - 1:8	actions [2] - 22:11, 34:23	appreciate [1] - 19:22
15:8, 19:5, 19:18, 20:11,	45 [2] - 10:2, 21:4	activity [1] - 34:8	appropriate [13] - 4:24,
21:8, 21:18	45 [2] - 10.2, 21.4 4th [4] - 17:7, 18:14,	actual [2] - 6:12, 14:16	23:13, 25:15, 26:4, 26:8,
135 [1] - 14:10	39:7, 40:9	adding [2] - 26:7, 28:23	26:9, 26:24, 26:25,
13th [4] - 40:23, 41:6,	39.1, 40.3	address [8] - 4:9, 31:11,	28:10, 28:15, 29:3, 30:2,
42:7, 42:10	5	32:4, 34:6, 34:8, 34:11,	30:6
14 [5] - 14:15, 22:21,	-	35:4, 38:17	April [1] - 13:24
22:25, 28:6, 29:15	55 [1] - 30:11	addressed [1] - 35:3	areas [1] - 5:16
15 [5] - 1:5, 14:18, 14:24,	588-9516 [1] - 1:25	administrative [1] -	arguably [1] - 25:20
30:12, 30:16		13:10	argue [4] - 27:15, 29:10,
15th [1] - 14:1	6	administratively [1] -	34:13, 35:1
16-MD-2738(FLW)(LHG	609 [1] - 1:25	8:18	argued [2] - 32:22, 33:16
[1] - 1:2	675 [1] - 44:23	adult [1] - 10:8	arguing [1] - 37:14
16th [2] - 39:22, 40:6	6th [4] - 21:11, 40:8,	affect [2] - 8:17, 20:21	argument [5] - 32:10,
17-5724 [1] - 32:8	40:22, 41:6	affidavits [3] - 8:14, 8:21,	33:5, 33:12, 33:17,
18 [1] - 10:8		9:23	37:16
18th [1] - 39:10	7	age [1] - 10:8	ARPS [1] - 2:6
1st [1] - 42:11	73 [1] - 31:23	agenda [1] - 4:7	art [1] - 16:15
	75 [1] - 31.23	agendas [1] - 32:1	asbestos [3] - 14:18,
2	7th [2] - 41:10, 41:14	ago [1] - 7:18	15:3, 16:25
20 [1] - 28:22	/ til [2] - 41.10, 41.14	agree [7] - 8:10, 9:8,	asbestos/talc [1] - 17:17
2005 [1] - 35:20	8	11:18, 26:24, 27:4, 27:6,	ASHCRAFT [1] - 1:15
2018 [1] - 1:5		28:1	Ashcroft [1] - 17:4
21 [2] - 14:18, 14:24	8 [1] - 30:24	agreed [3] - 35:15, 35:21,	aside [1] - 33:17
22nd [2] - 42:20, 42:23	8th [2] - 41:10, 41:14	36:1	asserted [1] - 29:10
23 [1] - 17:5	_	agreement [3] - 9:2,	assistance [1] - 38:11
23rd [7] - 40:4, 42:8,	9	31:10, 31:16	assisted [1] - 17:4
42:14, 42:19, 42:24,	9 [1] - 35:13	ahead [2] - 9:17, 25:12	Association [1] - 34:1
42:25, 43:2	90 [4] - 19:18, 20:13,	ALABAMA [1] - 1:14	assume [1] - 10:12
24th [2] - 42:8, 42:14	21:18	ALEXANDRA [1] - 2:11	assuming [1] - 6:25
25th [3] - 39:2, 40:5,	9th [16] - 39:21, 40:6,	allegation [1] - 34:24	assumption [1] - 6:10
40:18	40:10, 40:14, 40:15,	allegations [4] - 34:20,	attempt [1] - 35:24
26th [1] - 39:3	40:16, 40:17, 40:19,	36:5, 36:14, 37:18	attorney [2] - 44:13,
27 [1] - 35:20	40:22, 40:24, 41:2,	alleges [1] - 35:14	44:15
27th [3] - 13:22, 13:23,	41:10, 41:14, 41:15,	Allen [4] - 17:9, 17:14,	August [10] - 20:20,
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	40:20, 41:6, 41:8, 41:14,

41:18, 42:8, 42:11, 43:2 available [2] - 18:24, 42:5 avoid [2] - 21:22, 27:1 aware [3] - 5:7, 7:22, 32:14

В

Baby [1] - 16:5 backed [1] - 17:10 **background** [1] - 6:6 bad [1] - 41:7 **Bailey** [1] - 8:20 **BARRY** [1] - 2:10 based [1] - 6:10 **BE** [1] - 3:10 **BEASLEY** [1] - 1:13 Beasley [4] - 17:9, 17:14, 18:16, 31:3 becoming [1] - 11:22 began [1] - 15:6 beginning [1] - 5:17 begun [1] - 13:20 Behalf [2] - 1:22, 2:12 behalf [4] - 2:7, 2:14, 2:18, 35:23 behind [2] - 17:10, 17:12 **BEISNER** [1] - 2:7 **Beisner** [1] - 31:9 bell [1] - 29:21 **better** [1] - 27:9 between [1] - 5:23 **BIDDLE** [1] - 2:4 **Bill** [1] - 14:11 bit [3] - 4:4, 20:2, 20:21 blanket [1] - 27:22 block [1] - 11:19 **bottom** [2] - 34:9, 37:6 **brief** [8] - 32:15, 34:6, 34:16, 34:17, 34:20, 35:8, 35:13, 35:18 briefed [1] - 36:9 briefing [5] - 34:10, 35:2, 35:5, 37:2, 37:4 **briefly** [2] - 6:5, 32:5 bring [1] - 36:24 brought [1] - 13:18 **Brown** [1] - 32:7 **Brunswick** [1] - 17:20 bundles [2] - 15:1, 15:3 **BURNS** [3] - 1:18, 1:18, 13:15

BY [13] - 1:14, 1:15, 1:17, 1:18, 1:20, 1:21, 2:5, 2:7, 2:9, 2:11, 2:14, 2:16, 2:18

C

California [4] - 17:19, 18:4, 25:25, 31:13 cancer [10] - 15:16, 15:17, 17:6, 17:13, 22:12, 22:22, 24:2, 24:13, 24:23, 25:22 carcinogen [1] - 35:25 care [3] - 25:2, 31:18, 39:22 **CAROLINE** [1] - 2:14 **CASAMENTO** [1] - 2:11 case [20] - 4:21, 5:11, 5:12, 12:1, 12:4, 17:6, 17:9, 17:11, 17:13, 17:14, 18:15, 18:18, 23:3, 24:3, 24:13, 25:8, 28:6, 33:3 case-by-case [1] - 24:3 cases [39] - 15:16, 15:17, 15:18, 15:19, 16:25, 17:3, 17:16, 17:17, 17:22, 18:16, 18:17, 18:20, 18:24, 22:10, 22:20, 22:21, 23:11, 23:13, 23:17, 23:21, 23:22, 24:1, 27:20, 28:3, 28:5, 28:6, 29:2, 29:14, 29:15, 30:1, 30:4, 30:6, 30:11, 30:12, 30:22, 31:3, 31:7, 31:22 causing [1] - 23:12 **CCR** [3] - 1:24, 3:17, 44:23 ceremony [1] - 12:7 certain [2] - 15:1, 34:22 certainly [2] - 25:16, 36:22 **Certificate** [1] - 44:23 **CERTIFIED** [1] - 3:10 Certified [1] - 44:6 certify [2] - 44:7, 44:12 cetera [3] - 27:6, 34:23, 38:9 **change** [1] - 24:23 changed [1] - 24:15

CHAREST [1] - 1:18

checked [1] - 27:21

children [1] - 23:2 chosen [1] - 23:14 CHRISTOPHER [2] -1:17, 1:20 circumstance [1] - 28:11 CIVIL [1] - 1:2 claiming [2] - 26:14, 32:23 clarification [1] - 6:21 clarify [1] - 7:5 **CLARKSON** [1] - 1:8 classified [1] - 35:25 clean [1] - 23:14 clear [1] - 9:3 clearly [1] - 26:19 **CLERK** [2] - 4:2, 43:12 closer [1] - 5:25 **CMO** [1] - 30:24 co [1] - 41:16 co-counsel [1] - 41:16 Cohen [1] - 17:4 **COHEN** [1] - 1:19 collaboratively [1] -10:22 collectively [1] - 36:1 combined [1] - 35:15 coming [3] - 14:7, 39:8, 40:22 commerce [4] - 33:17, 37:8, 37:9, 37:12 Committee [2] - 1:22, 22:23 communications [2] -6:16, 9:2 **community** [1] - 19:2 compel [2] - 6:4, 6:23 compelling [2] - 7:1, 9:10 competing [2] - 4:9, 22:6 complaint [7] - 30:23, 30:25, 31:9, 34:13, 34:24, 36:3, 37:3 complaints [1] - 31:12 completed [1] - 17:25 conceal [1] - 33:23 concern [2] - 26:12, 33:11 **concerned** [1] - 19:3 concerns [1] - 32:12 conclude [1] - 29:12 concluded [1] - 43:13 conditions [1] - 23:20

confederated [1] - 35:16

confer [1] - 9:13 conference [3] - 22:4, 39:13, 39:21 CONFERENCE [1] - 1:5 confirm [1] - 15:8 confusion [1] - 7:4 conspiracy [7] - 33:19, 34:6, 34:7, 34:15, 35:4, 37:15, 37:16 conspired [4] - 33:23, 34:21, 35:16, 37:17 conspiring [2] - 34:14, 37:19 **consultants** [1] - 6:15 consulting [3] - 11:15, 11:21, 11:25 consumer [1] - 35:17 contention [1] - 30:14 **contentious** [1] - 38:23 context [1] - 30:3 continue [1] - 17:2 continued [1] - 1:23 contours [2] - 5:16, 6:12 contrived [1] - 35:15 control [2] - 10:18, 15:16 controls [3] - 12:8, 15:15 conversations [1] - 6:11 convey [2] - 36:21, 37:21 conveyed [1] - 15:7 **convinced** [1] - 9:18 cooperate [1] - 12:13 **cooperation** [1] - 11:23 correct [6] - 4:14, 5:25, 13:15, 32:1, 42:10, 43:7 Correct [1] - 4:21 correctly [2] - 15:14, 19:22 corresponded [1] -35:21 Cosmetic [1] - 33:25 cost [1] - 25:9 **COUGHLIN** [1] - 2:16 counsel [14] - 9:2, 9:3, 10:21, 10:24, 11:6, 12:6, 22:6, 22:8, 22:20, 30:10, 41:16, 42:5, 44:13, 44:15 country [6] - 14:12, 15:10, 16:3, 17:3, 17:18, 39:11 County [1] - 17:16 couple [2] - 7:23, 12:15 course [4] - 19:12, 34:7,

35:3, 36:8 Court [7] - 8:18, 9:7, 21:3, 30:8, 30:19, 44:6 **COURT** [4] - 1:1, 1:25, 3:17, 5:21 court [3] - 4:1, 17:3, 33:14 Court's [1] - 38:11 **COURTHOUSE** [1] - 1:8 **courtroom** [1] - 42:15 cover [1] - 16:12 creating [1] - 28:24 criteria [4] - 22:22, 22:24, 23:11, 24:11 critical [1] - 15:13 criticized [1] - 23:10 **CRR** [1] - 1:24 custody [1] - 10:18

D

D.C [3] - 2:7, 2:9, 26:1 Dakota [2] - 41:24, 41:25 **DANIEL** [1] - 1:21 date [9] - 17:15, 21:19, 27:2, 38:25, 39:1, 40:20, 42:19, 44:10 dates [8] - 5:18, 17:19, 20:14, 20:15, 20:22, 22:1, 39:4, 43:3 **Daubert** [5] - 15:11, 16:21, 17:2, 17:25, 21:25 daughter [1] - 41:19 days [14] - 7:24, 12:15, 13:21, 14:1, 14:2, 15:8, 19:5, 19:18, 20:11, 21:4, 21:8, 21:18, 41:7, 42:7 deal [6] - 24:14, 28:7, 28:18, 29:13, 29:22, 36:17 dealing [1] - 15:24 decide [5] - 24:8, 24:19, 27:17, 33:12, 33:13 declaration [1] - 19:12 **Defendant** [3] - 2:7, 2:12, 2:18 defendant [7] - 6:18, 16:7, 26:7, 26:16, 26:18, 28:10, 29:8 defendants [15] - 6:16, 6:21, 8:25, 10:17, 11:2, 13:21, 25:24, 26:3, 26:6, 26:20, 26:24, 27:14,

29:1, 31:8, 34:16 defense [1] - 22:6 defenses [1] - 27:15 define [2] - 26:21, 29:4 defining [1] - 27:10 definitely [1] - 21:6 **degree** [1] - 18:17 **Delaware** [2] - 26:1, 31:13 delay [2] - 4:5, 21:22 delays [1] - 21:17 delete [1] - 35:22 deleting [1] - 34:2 deposition [2] - 6:12, 38:20 **depositions** [2] - 5:15, 5:18 **DEPUTY** [2] - 4:2, 43:12 deputy [1] - 42:15 **describe** [1] - 14:3 develop [2] - 24:12, 24:23 diagnosed [3] - 25:22, 27:5, 27:11 died [3] - 23:1, 24:2, 24:6 **difference** [1] - 25:9 different [2] - 18:10, 37:15 difficult [1] - 11:22 diligently [2] - 15:6, 21:5 direct [1] - 26:10 directed [3] - 34:8, 37:12, 37:16 disagree [1] - 18:6 discovery [1] - 17:11 discretion [1] - 33:14 **discussion** [1] - 22:4 discussions [2] - 8:25, 20:8 dismiss [8] - 22:10, 23:9, 23:18, 27:23, 30:5, 32:6, 32:25, 33:13 dismissal [1] - 30:2 dismissals [3] - 4:10, 22:3, 29:23 dismissed [1] - 22:15 dispute [2] - 22:9, 28:19 disputed [1] - 29:7 disputes [1] - 28:24 distinct [1] - 18:10 **District** [1] - 25:7

DISTRICT [2] - 1:1, 1:1

diversity [1] - 32:24

docket [3] - 23:12, 30:25, 32:7 document [2] - 11:10, 15:2 documents [9] - 6:3, 6:22, 7:7, 7:13, 7:21, 8:8, 9:6, 9:9, 10:20 done [12] - 7:3, 12:3, 14:13, 15:23, 19:21, 19:22, 20:18, 21:23, 22:2, 23:22, 26:10, 43:7 down [4] - 14:23, 21:21, 31:5, 31:19 **Dr** [19] - 7:3, 8:19, 8:20, 9:11, 14:10, 14:20, 15:7, 15:25, 16:14, 16:23, 17:6, 17:21, 18:2, 18:8, 18:13, 18:16, 19:13, 20:8, 21:6 draft [1] - 29:17 drafted [1] - 23:20 **DRINKER** [1] - 2:4 driving [1] - 41:18 **DUFFY** [1] - 2:16 duplicate [1] - 31:22 duty [1] - 21:3

Ε

early [3] - 39:15, 39:25

easier [4] - 29:6, 33:15, 36:24, 38:1 **EAST** [1] - 1:8 easy [2] - 23:16, 26:21 edit [1] - 35:21 Edna [1] - 32:7 effect [1] - 21:21 either [4] - 10:11, 31:13, 39:3, 42:22 electron [1] - 14:14 **ELLIS** [1] - 2:13 email [1] - 11:6 emailed [1] - 10:24 employee [2] - 44:13, 44:15 end [3] - 20:9, 21:5, 21:16 ensure [1] - 16:12 enter [1] - 8:11 entire [1] - 42:9 **ENTITLED** [1] - 3:12 **ESQUIRE** [15] - 1:14, 1:15, 1:17, 1:18, 1:20,

1:21, 2:5, 2:5, 2:7, 2:9, 2:11, 2:11, 2:14, 2:16, 2:18 **ESQUIRES** [13] - 1:13, 1:15, 1:16, 1:18, 1:19, 1:21, 2:4, 2:6, 2:9, 2:10, 2:13, 2:16, 2:17 essentially [3] - 18:23, 27:22, 27:23 estimates [1] - 19:22 et [3] - 27:6, 34:23, 38:9 evening [1] - 40:3 exact [1] - 22:1 exactly [1] - 27:4 example [3] - 31:4, 32:5, 32:7 excellent [1] - 38:24 except [1] - 28:17 expect [2] - 13:20, 18:13 expectation [1] - 8:23 expense [1] - 12:22 expert [5] - 14:10, 16:24, 17:7, 17:21, 22:23 experts [6] - 6:15, 10:15, 11:15, 11:18, 11:21, 11:25 **EXRD** [1] - 14:17 **extended** [1] - 21:20 extension [1] - 21:22

F

extent [1] - 11:16

facilitate [1] - 11:10 facility [1] - 16:15 fact [13] - 4:24, 6:9, 6:14, 7:2, 8:3, 8:15, 9:23, 10:21, 24:12, 36:5, 37:11, 40:21 facts [1] - 21:10 fair [1] - 6:1 **false** [1] - 36:2 familiar [1] - 33:2 February [1] - 21:11 federal [1] - 31:14 few [1] - 18:7 fibers [2] - 14:17, 15:4 **FIELD** [1] - 2:18 figure [3] - 8:4, 11:12, 25:10 figured [1] - 8:5 file [13] - 8:17, 13:7, 24:13, 24:24, 25:1, 25:2,

25:12, 25:21, 26:4, 27:12, 27:13, 27:16 filed [6] - 7:25, 13:11, 30:23, 31:4, 31:9, 32:25 filing [6] - 23:10, 23:20, 24:15, 25:16, 30:24, 31:5 finality [1] - 26:20 **financially** [1] - 44:16 fine [4] - 28:17, 40:16, 41:3, 42:22 finished [2] - 21:3, 21:4 finite [1] - 15:20 firm [12] - 4:21, 17:4, 17:9, 17:15, 18:14, 32:12, 32:16, 32:17, 34:12, 36:19, 38:2, 38:11 firms [3] - 17:5, 17:10, 23:14 first [10] - 4:18, 8:9, 9:14, 12:14, 29:20, 29:21, 33:13, 34:5, 37:7 **FISHER** [1] - 1:8 fit [1] - 24:10 **FLOM** [1] - 2:6 Florida [1] - 25:20 **FLORIDA** [1] - 1:17 fly [2] - 36:15, 37:13 **flying** [1] - 40:25 focus [2] - 33:9, 33:19 **followed** [1] - 17:8 **FOLLOWING** [1] - 3:10 following [1] - 41:9 **FOR** [1] - 1:1 Force [2] - 34:2, 34:23 foregoing [1] - 44:8 Forest [1] - 17:10 forgotten [1] - 25:23 form [6] - 7:19, 23:23, 24:18, 30:23, 30:24, 31:8 formed [1] - 34:1 forth [5] - 5:17, 26:5, 33:12, 44:11 forum [1] - 27:23 forward [3] - 17:22, 23:3, 42:16 Fragrance [1] - 33:25 fraudulent [1] - 26:13 **FREDA** [1] - 1:10 frustrating [3] - 16:19, 16:22, 17:23

future [5] - 15:19, 15:23, 24:24, 26:2, 26:7

G

general [1] - 33:8 Gerel [1] - 17:4 **GEREL** [1] - 1:15 given [6] - 9:25, 16:18, 19:23, 22:6, 22:7, 33:11 global [2] - 23:23, 24:18 go-to [1] - 16:24 **GORDON** [1] - 2:17 govern [1] - 4:23 graduate [1] - 41:19 great [2] - 18:19, 21:24 group [1] - 34:25 groups [1] - 36:4 guess [7] - 6:20, 20:5, 24:6, 32:12, 32:20, 36:18, 43:9

Н

half [1] - 13:22 hand [3] - 8:15, 11:14, 35:10 happy [3] - 20:23, 29:18, 38:19 hard [1] - 16:16 heard [2] - 7:19, 10:14 hearing [5] - 7:5, 16:22, 17:2, 17:25, 21:25 heirs [1] - 23:1 held [1] - 8:24 help [1] - 42:17 hereby [1] - 44:7 hereinbefore [1] - 44:10 herself [1] - 7:16 hesitant [1] - 37:22 hide [1] - 33:23 hiding [1] - 34:2 highlight [1] - 38:14 **highlighting** [1] - 34:18 **highlights** [1] - 35:7 holding [1] - 8:15 home [11] - 10:5, 10:6, 10:7, 10:9, 25:1, 25:3, 25:12, 25:16, 27:13, 29:7, 29:8 Honor [41] - 4:14, 4:22, 5:7, 5:20, 6:1, 6:5, 7:14, 8:13, 12:24, 13:2, 13:10, 13:15, 13:25, 14:3, 15:3,

15:18, 15:24, 18:5, 18:21, 20:23, 21:9, 22:16, 23:10, 25:4, 26:3, 28:9, 29:19, 29:24, 30:22, 31:24, 32:14, 32:18, 33:3, 33:21, 35:9, 36:22, 37:21, 38:21, 38:23, 41:13, 43:8 **HONORABLE** [1] - 1:10 hope [3] - 4:11, 5:12, 18:1 hoped [1] - 22:4 hours [5] - 14:15, 14:18, 14:19, 14:24, 19:23 Hunchareck [1] - 8:20 husband [1] - 23:1

ı

idea [2] - 10:25, 37:8 **Illinois** [9] - 33:1, 33:6, 33:18, 34:8, 36:6, 37:13, 37:17, 37:19 Imerys [21] - 2:18, 5:24, 12:6, 12:10, 13:14, 13:24, 16:8, 26:1, 32:6, 32:22, 32:25, 33:23, 33:24, 34:22, 35:14, 35:20, 35:25, 36:9, 36:12, 36:18, 42:4 **Imerys'** [1] - 10:21 immediately [1] - 9:9 impasse [1] - 4:13 important [2] - 11:11, 16:2 impression [1] - 10:19 **IN** [2] - 1:4, 3:11 inadequate [1] - 34:11 incidental [1] - 10:16 include [1] - 24:5 includes [1] - 4:8 **including** [1] - 5:18 indicated [1] - 15:25 **indication** [1] - 9:16 individual [3] - 10:3, 29:14, 29:15 **individually** [1] - 23:19 inform [1] - 21:3 **information** [7] - 19:20, 20:3, 21:13, 33:24, 34:2, 34:22, 36:2 injuries [1] - 35:17 instance [3] - 23:7,

25:24, 35:5

instances [2] - 22:21, 23:13 interested [1] - 44:16 Interested [1] - 34:1 interim [1] - 43:4 involve [2] - 14:13, 22:25 involved [8] - 7:8, 9:4, 16:24, 18:15, 19:23, 20:5, 21:12, 36:4 **involves** [1] - 34:15 involving [1] - 32:6 **IS** [1] - 3:10 issue [13] - 4:19, 5:4, 5:13, 5:15, 9:14, 11:8, 11:9, 11:12, 11:16, 24:20, 28:11, 30:3, 30:9 issues [11] - 4:8, 4:17, 5:10, 5:22, 7:9, 9:5, 13:13, 29:16, 34:11, 38:16, 38:17 Item [1] - 29:22 items [1] - 32:1 itself [2] - 6:12, 19:4 **IV** [2] - 30:10, 30:18

1

J&J [12] - 5:23, 12:10, 13:23, 16:8, 25:25, 30:11, 32:22, 33:23, 33:24, 34:21, 35:14, 35:20 jealous [1] - 41:17 **Jeopardy** [1] - 29:21 **JERSEY** [6] - 1:1, 1:20, 1:21, 2:11, 2:11, 2:16 Jersey [7] - 25:1, 25:7, 25:19, 25:21, 25:25, 31:13, 44:7 **JOHN** [1] - 2:7 **JOHNSON** [2] - 1:4 **Johnson** [4] - 2:7, 26:6 join [2] - 26:16, 26:17 joinder [2] - 26:13, 26:16 joining [1] - 26:14 joint [1] - 23:4 jointly [1] - 12:9 **JUDGE** [78] - 4:3, 4:15, 5:1, 5:8, 5:13, 6:2, 6:7, 7:11, 7:15, 9:12, 9:21, 10:4, 10:7, 11:3, 11:13, 12:16, 12:21, 12:25, 13:4, 13:12, 13:16, 14:5, 16:21, 19:3, 19:7, 20:7,

21:1, 21:16, 22:18, 24:4, 25:2, 25:10, 26:9, 27:8, 27:25, 28:17, 29:15, 29:20, 30:21, 31:21, 31:25, 32:4, 32:15, 32:20, 33:6, 33:8, 33:22, 35:12, 36:23, 37:5, 37:23, 38:5, 38:7, 38:13, 38:24, 39:6, 39:11, 39:18, 39:24, 40:2, 40:5, 40:8, 40:12, 40:14, 40:17, 41:2, 41:5, 41:10, 41:14, 41:21, 42:1, 42:6, 42:9, 42:13, 42:20, 42:23, 42:25, 43:9 Judge [8] - 4:20, 5:14, 13:14, 20:16, 21:10, 27:18, 37:1, 43:5 judge [1] - 4:22 **JULIE** [1] - 2:5 July [12] - 20:19, 35:20, 39:2, 39:7, 39:20, 39:25, 40:4, 40:9, 40:17, 40:18, 40:24, 43:2 jumping [1] - 23:5 June [7] - 17:7, 18:14, 20:24, 38:25, 39:10, 39:12, 40:18 jurisdiction [24] - 18:23, 25:11, 27:3, 27:6, 27:14, 27:16, 28:10, 28:14, 28:25, 29:1, 29:2, 29:4, 29:9, 31:15, 33:1, 33:4, 33:9, 33:10, 36:12, 36:18, 37:10, 38:8 jurisdictions [2] - 25:15, 26:21

Κ

keep [1] - 34:22 Kentucky [2] - 4:23, 5:11 kind [3] - 8:11, 19:12, 24:12 kindly [1] - 31:1 knowingly [1] - 35:15 knows [1] - 26:22

L

lab [11] - 14:2, 14:5, 14:6, 14:10, 14:11, 14:12, 16:2, 16:14, 19:25, 20:4 lack [1] - 33:1 laid [2] - 21:10, 25:15 language [3] - 27:9, 34:16, 35:8 Lanier [1] - 17:4 **LAPINSKI** [2] - 1:21, 38:22 **Lapinski** [1] - 38:19 last [9] - 7:20, 7:23, 8:19, 9:24, 9:25, 12:14, 15:8, 22:7, 39:13 lastly [1] - 25:23 late [1] - 8:19 law [3] - 4:21, 10:10, 25:6 lawsuit [1] - 25:9 lawyers [3] - 4:24, 17:2, 17:13 learned [1] - 6:9 least [2] - 9:1, 9:10 leave [5] - 24:20, 27:10, 28:25, 29:8, 40:11 leaves [1] - 27:14 leaving [1] - 24:11 legitimate [2] - 23:8, 26:15 **LEIGH** [1] - 1:14 less [2] - 19:17, 21:7 letter [3] - 6:7, 7:12, 21:10 letters [1] - 5:16 **LEVIN** [1] - 1:16 likely [1] - 15:22 **Limitations** [1] - 24:16 limited [4] - 15:22, 25:5, 27:9, 28:1 line [3] - 34:9, 35:18, 37:6 **Linear** [1] - 18:14 list [3] - 22:20, 31:1, 31:3 listed [2] - 22:21, 31:7 **literature** [1] - 15:12 **litigating** [1] - 7:9 litigation [4] - 6:15, 9:3, 11:20, 23:12 lived [2] - 25:19, 28:13 **LLC** [2] - 2:14

local [3] - 7:25, 8:16,

location [1] - 28:14

LOCKE [1] - 2:9

Locke [1] - 29:25

lodged [1] - 18:23

32:23

Longo [14] - 14:20, 15:7, 15:25, 16:14, 16:23, 17:6, 17:21, 18:2, 18:8, 18:13, 18:16, 19:13, 20:8, 21:6 Longo's [1] - 14:11 look [6] - 4:17, 9:19, 11:13, 22:2, 30:11, 31:20 looking [5] - 8:1, 10:10, 25:13, 29:2, 32:10 loosely [1] - 35:2 lose [1] - 34:16 loss [1] - 20:2 Louis [7] - 17:9, 17:12, 17:16, 18:3, 18:14

М

man [1] - 19:23 March [2] - 13:22, 13:23 **MARK** [1] - 2:16 **MARKETING** [1] - 1:5 master [1] - 30:25 material [1] - 15:21 **Materials** [1] - 14:11 materials [1] - 10:23 **MATTER** [1] - 3:12 matter [3] - 26:2, 31:14, 42:21 MAY [1] - 1:5 McTIERNAN [1] - 2:10 **MDL** [13] - 4:23, 15:14, 15:16, 18:4, 18:11, 24:24, 25:13, 27:12, 29:7, 31:11, 36:13, 38:3, 38:5 **MEAGHER** [1] - 2:6 mean [4] - 15:3, 28:21, 28:22, 37:12 means [2] - 28:19, 29:11 meet [4] - 9:13, 22:22, 23:11, 40:19 members [1] - 33:25 merits [1] - 34:4 mesothelioma [1] -15:17 message [1] - 32:20 **methodology** [4] - 15:9, 15:11, 15:12, 19:1 **MICHELLE** [1] - 1:15 microscopy [1] - 14:14 **mid** [1] - 20:20

mid-August [1] - 20:20 might [4] - 11:17, 36:24, 38:1, 40:25 Miller [7] - 32:12, 32:16, 34:12, 36:19, 38:2, 38:11 mind [2] - 24:15, 24:23 mines [1] - 16:9 missing [1] - 42:17 Missouri [1] - 17:7 MISSOURI [1] - 2:14 moment [1] - 4:16 month [4] - 13:22, 39:12, 39:15, 39:21 months [3] - 7:18, 10:14, 24:7 moreover [1] - 34:12 morning [5] - 4:4, 4:5, 29:25, 40:10, 41:1 most [3] - 5:22, 15:22, 31:17 motion [8] - 27:1, 30:13, 30:15, 32:6, 32:13, 32:25, 33:12, 36:25 motions [2] - 6:4, 32:6 move [6] - 9:17, 12:23, 13:4, 20:20, 23:3, 39:24 moved [3] - 13:3, 25:20, 28:13 moving [2] - 17:22, 39:20 **MR** [25] - 5:20, 6:1, 6:5, 6:8, 7:14, 8:13, 9:22, 10:6, 10:15, 11:6, 12:24, 13:2, 13:9, 13:15, 27:18, 33:3, 33:7, 33:21, 35:9, 37:1, 38:4, 38:6, 38:10, 38:22, 42:4 **MS** [70] - 4:14, 4:22, 5:6, 5:10, 5:12, 7:17, 9:18, 9:25, 10:9, 11:5, 11:8, 12:12, 12:20, 13:5, 13:23, 14:9, 16:19, 16:23, 18:5, 19:6, 20:6, 20:23, 21:2, 22:16, 22:19, 23:16, 24:22, 25:4, 25:14, 27:4, 28:9, 29:14, 29:18, 29:24, 30:22, 31:24, 32:2, 32:3, 32:14, 32:18, 36:21, 37:21, 38:19, 39:5, 39:10, 39:17, 39:20, 40:1, 40:3, 40:7, 40:10, 40:13, 40:15, 40:16,

40:24, 41:4, 41:8, 41:12, 41:13, 41:15, 41:18, 41:23, 41:25, 42:2, 42:8, 42:11, 42:19, 42:22, 42:24, 43:8 multi [2] - 17:8, 31:12 multi-plaintiff [2] - 17:8, 31:12 multiple [2] - 14:22, 19:8 Muscat [2] - 7:4, 9:11 **MY** [1] - 3:11

Ν

named [3] - 27:14, 32:22, 32:23 naming [1] - 32:24 national [1] - 42:5 necessarily [1] - 5:24 necessary [1] - 19:11 need [17] - 6:21, 8:4, 8:21, 9:12, 11:12, 12:16, 13:25, 21:6, 29:22, 30:1, 30:4, 30:19, 31:4, 34:9, 35:6, 36:23, 38:11 needed [2] - 15:25, 30:13 needs [1] - 15:8 negotiated [1] - 7:18 negotiating [1] - 6:11 New [8] - 17:20, 25:1, 25:7, 25:19, 25:21, 25:25, 31:13, 44:7 new [1] - 24:13 **NEW** [6] - 1:1, 1:20, 1:21, 2:11, 2:11, 2:16 next [4] - 21:19, 38:25, 39:6, 43:3 night [2] - 15:8, 22:7 **NJ** [1] - 1:8 **NO** [1] - 1:2 nobody [1] - 32:16 nonparty [1] - 6:4 North [2] - 41:24, 41:25 **NOTES** [1] - 3:11 nothing [1] - 7:20 notice [2] - 6:12, 30:24 **notices** [1] - 31:4 **notion** [2] - 33:22, 34:14 number [5] - 15:1, 16:3, 21:12, 30:25, 31:5 numeral [3] - 30:10, 30:18, 30:19

0 O'DELL [30] - 1:14, 4:14, 5:6, 5:10, 13:23, 14:9, 18:5, 19:6, 20:23, 21:2, 22:16, 22:19, 25:4, 25:14, 28:9, 29:18, 30:22, 31:24, 32:2, 32:14, 36:21, 37:21, 39:20, 40:16, 41:13, 41:15, 41:25, 42:19, 42:22, 43:8 O'Dell [1] - 27:20 obviously [4] - 20:15, 21:25, 22:9, 33:9 occurred [1] - 28:16 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:4, 3:11 **OFFICIAL** [2] - 1:25, 3:17 Official [1] - 44:5 often [1] - 23:10 once [3] - 8:5, 8:7, 33:4 one [15] - 4:8, 5:2, 7:3, 16:2, 17:18, 17:20, 29:12, 32:5, 32:21, 33:16, 38:15, 42:22 ones [3] - 24:6, 28:7, 29:6 ongoing [1] - 18:11 open [4] - 4:1, 24:11, 27:15, 29:8 operate [1] - 9:13 opportunity [2] - 15:21, 29:24 opposed [3] - 19:18, 27:10, 36:6 **opposition** [1] - 32:15 oral [1] - 32:10 order [13] - 7:1, 8:12, 9:10, 9:13, 23:24, 24:18, 25:14, 26:5, 27:19, 27:22, 28:4, 30:4, 38:20 orders [4] - 4:9, 22:6, 22:7, 29:13 outlined [1] - 28:5 outside [1] - 22:24 ovarian [8] - 15:15, 15:17, 17:6, 17:13, 17:16, 22:12, 24:1,

Ρ

24:23

page [2] - 35:13, 35:19 **PAPANTONIO** [1] - 1:16

35:14

plaintiffs [18] - 5:23,

papers [1] - 35:22 paragraph [2] - 23:25 parameters [1] - 28:5 Parfitt [1] - 18:15 **PARFITT** [5] - 1:15, 29:24, 32:18, 40:15, 40:24 part [5] - 34:24, 35:2, 35:21, 36:5, 39:15 particular [5] - 4:20, 15:23, 23:11, 28:6, 28:12 parties [3] - 11:14, 34:10, 44:14 Party [1] - 34:1 party [1] - 6:3 past [1] - 23:23 **PATRICIA** [1] - 2:11 pause [1] - 33:11 paying [1] - 11:25 **PCPC** [5] - 2:12, 5:25, 26:1, 29:22, 30:2 pending [1] - 15:19 PENNSYLVANIA [1] **people** [9] - 10:10, 10:13, 10:16, 12:9, 12:11, 14:5, 19:25, 20:5 per [2] - 14:15, 14:19 perhaps [1] - 19:9 period [2] - 16:6, 28:13 permitted [1] - 26:16 personal [4] - 10:2, 10:3, 33:1, 37:10 personally [1] - 12:3 perspective [2] - 23:9, 41:22 phone [2] - 4:11, 22:13 pick [1] - 40:20 picked [1] - 14:5 **Pisano** [6] - 4:20, 5:15, 13:14, 20:16, 21:10, place [3] - 5:24, 25:21, 44:10 Placitella [1] - 17:5 **PLACITELLA** [3] - 1:19, 1:20, 35:9 plaintiff [10] - 17:6, 17:8, 23:8, 25:17, 26:6, 28:12, 29:7, 31:12, 33:18,

7:19, 8:7, 13:20, 16:25, 22:10, 22:20, 22:25, 23:5, 23:10, 23:24, 26:22, 27:22, 30:14, 31:11, 31:17, 36:12, 37:2 **Plaintiffs** [2] - 1:22, 22:23 plaintiffs' [5] - 16:24, 20:9, 22:8, 22:21, 27:19 plans [1] - 39:13 pleading [1] - 30:17 point [15] - 5:3, 5:8, 6:24, 8:12, 18:21, 21:11, 23:25, 24:7, 24:12, 26:13, 28:7, 29:10, 30:20, 34:5, 35:4 pointed [3] - 15:14, 19:8, 36:9 populated [1] - 23:12 portions [1] - 35:22 position [1] - 8:6 **possible** [4] - 16:17, 20:25, 21:7, 42:2 post [1] - 30:16 **POWDER** [1] - 1:5 **Powder** [1] - 16:5 powder [1] - 16:9 practice [1] - 27:2 **PRACTICES** [1] - 1:5 precluded [1] - 26:6 prefer [2] - 11:17, 11:22 preferred [1] - 41:15 prejudice [2] - 23:9, 27:23 premature [1] - 8:11 premier [2] - 14:12, 16:2 preparation [1] - 14:21 prepare [2] - 14:15, 17:2 preparing [1] - 14:23 present [2] - 16:7, 38:21 presented [1] - 13:14 **preserve** [1] - 27:8 pressed [2] - 16:16, 20:25 **pressing** [1] - 17:15 pretty [2] - 24:22, 25:6 prevent [1] - 35:24 previously [2] - 20:16, 20:17 primary [1] - 25:18 **priority** [1] - 18:4 privilege [1] - 13:13

problem [7] - 13:9, 27:18, 30:8, 31:6, 39:1, 42:4, 42:17 problems [4] - 35:7, 36:8, 36:10, 39:19 proceed [3] - 24:2, 24:7, 24:8 proceedings [2] - 43:13, 44:9 process [4] - 9:22, 10:23, 14:3, 15:4 produced [2] - 10:24, 18:11 producing [1] - 22:23 product [1] - 27:5 **production** [2] - 6:24, 11:10 **products** [1] - 16:5 **PRODUCTS** [1] - 1:5 **Program** [1] - 35:24 progress [1] - 25:8 progressing [1] - 17:12 proof [3] - 7:24, 8:1, 13:7 **propose** [1] - 27:3 proposed [4] - 22:7, 25:14, 26:5, 27:19 **protocol** [4] - 4:19, 4:23, 15:15, 38:20 **provide** [2] - 8:21, 36:22 provided [1] - 31:1 **providing** [1] - 20:3 **PTI** [3] - 2:14, 17:14 **public** [1] - 36:2 published [1] - 15:12 **pull** [1] - 6:16 **pulled** [1] - 9:3 purports [1] - 7:24 purposes [2] - 9:1, 25:16 **PURSUANT** [1] - 3:9 pursuant [1] - 30:12 **pursue** [1] - 36:23 put [4] - 26:5, 33:17, 37:11, 37:24 putting [2] - 12:17, 37:8

Q

questions [1] - 19:19 quibbling [1] - 21:16 quickly [4] - 16:17, 20:25, 21:7, 21:24 quote [2] - 23:5, 34:15

R raise [1] - 28:11 raised [6] - 4:19, 5:11, 11:9, 12:14, 12:17, 15:20 rang [1] - 29:21 rather [1] - 23:23 re [6] - 8:22, 23:20, 24:15, 24:24, 27:12, 27:13 **RE** [1] - 1:4 re-file [3] - 24:24, 27:12, 27:13 re-filing [2] - 23:20, 24:15 re-serve [1] - 8:22 reach [1] - 38:10 reached [3] - 4:12, 22:19, 31:16 read [1] - 6:7 reading [2] - 7:11, 27:19 ready [1] - 32:9 real [6] - 11:13, 12:5, 19:4, 19:10, 22:9, 34:4 reality [1] - 18:2 really [14] - 6:8, 19:11, 20:25, 21:11, 21:13, 23:16, 26:19, 34:10, 36:15, 36:17, 36:19, 37:14, 37:18, 39:14 reason [6] - 8:23, 12:22, 21:20, 23:2, 23:8, 28:18 reasonable [1] - 20:11 reasons [3] - 22:13, 22:14, 23:17 **REATH** [1] - 2:4 recent [1] - 18:8 recently [2] - 12:17, 15:7 recognize [1] - 33:3 reconcile [2] - 30:1, 31:2 reconciliation [2] - 30:5, record [5] - 21:9, 35:6, 35:10, 36:25, 37:7 **REES** [1] - 2:17 refuse [1] - 12:2 regard [7] - 4:10, 5:24, 13:14, 30:3, 30:9, 33:18, 40:24 **regulatory** [1] - 9:5 related [2] - 7:9, 30:22

relation [1] - 18:9

30:16

relative [2] - 44:12, 44:15 release [1] - 36:2 rely [1] - 34:13 remaining [2] - 9:11, 23:2 remains [1] - 5:12 remand [3] - 32:6, 33:13, 38:8 remanded [1] - 32:24 remands [1] - 38:15 reply [2] - 34:6, 36:10 report [5] - 20:24, 21:6, 23:5, 30:7, 38:19 **REPORTER** [2] - 1:25, 3:17 Reporter [2] - 44:6 reports [2] - 11:16, 22:24 representative [3] - 10:1, 16:4, 16:12 requested [1] - 16:1 require [2] - 7:25, 14:6 required [2] - 14:4, 30:15 requires [2] - 10:2, 14:18 resident [2] - 25:17, 25:23 residents [1] - 31:12 resolution [2] - 4:12, 22:5 resolve [1] - 24:17 resolved [1] - 4:20 respect [2] - 9:11, 31:7 respond [1] - 7:15 responded [1] - 32:13 responsibility [1] - 18:25 responsive [1] - 30:16 retailer [1] - 32:25 retained [7] - 6:15, 10:17, 11:1, 11:3, 11:15, 12:1, 18:16 retaining [1] - 6:18 returned [1] - 6:19 review [2] - 8:8, 9:1 reviewed [1] - 10:20 rights [1] - 27:8 rise [2] - 4:2, 43:12 Roman [3] - 30:10, 30:18, 30:19 room [1] - 41:20 **ROTH** [1] - 1:19 Royston [1] - 2:14 **RPR** [1] - 1:24 Rule [3] - 10:2, 30:12,

ruled [1] - 4:23 rules [2] - 7:25, 8:17 run [1] - 24:16 Russoniello [4] - 3:16, 44:5, 44:22, 44:23 RUSSONIELLO [2] -1:24, 3:17

S

S/Vincent [2] - 3:16, 44:22 **SALES** [1] - 1:5 sample [5] - 14:16, 14:19, 14:21, 20:18 samples [16] - 13:18, 13:24, 14:10, 14:13, 14:15, 14:23, 15:5, 15:23, 16:3, 16:8, 18:9, 18:10, 18:22, 19:24, 21:12 sampling [1] - 4:19 save [2] - 19:15, 19:16 saw [1] - 5:16 schedule [1] - 41:17 school [1] - 41:19 science [2] - 7:9, 9:5 science-related [1] - 7:9 scientific [2] - 19:1, 35:22 scientists [2] - 7:8, 16:15 seated [1] - 4:4 second [1] - 25:9 **SECTION** [1] - 3:9 see [9] - 4:6, 11:22, 12:18, 17:25, 20:12, 36:8, 37:6, 37:15, 38:2 seeing [1] - 36:3 send [1] - 42:15 sent [2] - 4:7, 7:24 separate [1] - 28:4 **September** [3] - 14:1, 17:24, 20:19 serve [3] - 8:7, 8:22, 12:3 served [15] - 6:10, 7:2, 7:6, 8:3, 8:6, 8:8, 8:16, 8:19, 8:20, 9:21, 9:22, 10:4, 10:6, 10:13, 13:6 server [1] - 9:22 service [19] - 7:23, 7:25, 8:2, 8:3, 8:14, 8:17, 9:15, 9:16, 9:17, 9:19, 10:2, 10:3, 10:8, 10:11, 11:11, 11:18, 12:2, 12:8,

19:4, 20:4, 21:14, 43:6

13:7 Services [1] - 14:11 serving [1] - 10:1 set [6] - 17:7, 17:12, 20:16, 21:25, 32:11, 44:10 setting [2] - 20:17, 26:20 seven [2] - 7:18, 10:14 several [1] - 15:20 **SEYFARRTH** [1] - 2:9 **Sharko** [8] - 7:15, 9:24, 12:6, 15:14, 15:20, 16:22, 18:6, 25:5 **SHARKO** [38] - 2:5, 4:22, 5:12, 7:17, 9:18, 9:25, 10:9, 11:5, 11:8, 12:12, 12:20, 13:5, 16:19, 16:23, 20:6, 23:16, 24:22, 27:4, 29:14, 32:3, 38:19, 39:5, 39:10, 39:17, 40:1, 40:3, 40:7, 40:10, 40:13, 41:4, 41:8, 41:12, 41:18, 41:23, 42:2, 42:8, 42:11, 42:24 Sharko's [2] - 28:1, 41:17 **SHAW** [1] - 2:9 **ship** [1] - 23:6 **shop** [1] - 27:23 short [3] - 30:23, 30:24, shorten [1] - 20:12 **shorter** [1] - 20:10 show [1] - 9:15 Shower [2] - 16:5 signatories [1] - 4:25 **signature** [1] - 38:21 significant [1] - 4:8 **Signy** [1] - 31:1 **silence** [1] - 12:15 **silly** [1] - 10:19 **SILVER** [11] - 2:16, 13:2, 27:18, 33:3, 33:7, 33:21, 37:1, 38:4, 38:6, 38:10, 42:4 **Silver** [1] - 31:10 similar [1] - 5:10 similarly [2] - 24:10, 30:9 simple [3] - 24:22, 25:6, 29:12 simply [1] - 27:11 sit [1] - 17:1 **situation** [1] - 23:4

six [1] - 24:7 **SKADDEN** [1] - 2:6 **SLATE** [1] - 2:6 someone [2] - 26:14, 37:25 **sometime** [1] - 22:8 soon [2] - 15:5, 21:2 sooner [1] - 43:7 **sorry** [2] - 4:4, 13:1 sought [1] - 23:8 **sound** [1] - 33:2 **sourced** [1] - 16:10 specific [4] - 15:4, 29:2, 33:10, 37:10 **specifically** [2] - 33:24, 34:8 sped [1] - 14:21 **spoken** [2] - 10:21, 30:10 **spot** [1] - 37:24 **St** [7] - 17:9, 17:12, 17:15, 18:3, 18:14 **standing** [1] - 12:7 start [3] - 14:9, 18:7, 28:23 started [1] - 19:5 **STATE** [1] - 1:8 state [14] - 4:21, 15:17, 16:15, 17:3, 25:1, 25:3, 25:12, 25:17, 27:13, 28:12, 29:7, 29:8 **State** [1] - 44:7 statements [1] - 10:1 **States** [2] - 35:23, 44:5 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 states [4] - 25:18, 25:24, 26:4, 31:18 station [1] - 17:1 **status** [1] - 23:5 **STATUS** [1] - 1:5 **Statute** [1] - 24:16 **stay** [4] - 35:9, 36:13, 38:3, 38:5 Steering [2] - 1:22, 22:23 STENOGRAPHIC [1] -3:11 stenographically [1] -44:9 still [8] - 17:23, 24:14, 24:16, 24:19, 31:22, 34:14, 36:12, 37:6 stipulation [1] - 23:19

stops [1] - 41:23

strangers [1] - 11:20

stream [4] - 33:17, 37:8, 37:9, 37:12 **STREET** [1] - 1:8 subject [1] - 31:14 submitted [1] - 35:23 **submitting** [1] - 5:14 subpoena [2] - 6:13, 7:19 subpoenas [1] - 13:6 substantial [9] - 5:22, 25:8, 28:12, 28:19, 28:21, 28:22, 29:5, 29:11 substantially [1] - 27:11 suggested [2] - 13:25, 23:4 suggesting [2] - 20:19, 26:23 suggestion [2] - 18:18, 28:1 suggests [3] - 34:17, 34:20, 35:3 **SUSAN** [1] - 2:5

Т

table [1] - 12:18 **Talc** [2] - 2:18, 34:1 talc [1] - 35:24 talcum [1] - 16:9 targeted [1] - 36:6 Task [2] - 34:1, 34:23 task [1] - 18:22 tat [1] - 12:16 **TAYLOR** [1] - 2:11 team [2] - 14:20, 16:14 technicians [2] - 14:22, 19:9 **TEM** [3] - 14:13, 14:16, 14:24 term [1] - 24:5 terms [1] - 21:14 **TERSIGNI** [1] - 2:5 test [2] - 14:10, 18:22 tested [1] - 16:4 testified [3] - 15:10, 18:8, 18:9 testify [1] - 18:13 testing [19] - 13:18, 13:19, 14:4, 14:12, 14:13, 14:14, 15:9, 15:22, 16:12, 17:24, 18:3, 18:9, 18:11, 18:25,

TEXAS [1] - 1:18 **THE** [7] - 1:1, 1:10, 3:9, 3:11, 4:2, 5:21, 43:12 themselves [2] - 23:14, 35:16 theory [5] - 33:19, 34:6, 34:7, 34:15, 35:4 therefore [1] - 13:19 they've [1] - 32:21 thick [1] - 21:13 third [2] - 6:3, 11:14 third-party [1] - 6:3 **THOMAS** [1] - 2:9 **THORNTON** [1] - 2:18 three [6] - 6:4, 6:22, 7:7, 26:21, 34:21, 39:8 tight [1] - 39:12 timeframe [3] - 15:5, 16:13, 16:18 **TINSLEY** [1] - 2:14 **TIPTF** [2] - 35:21, 36:1 Tisi [4] - 7:24, 10:12, 12:12, 12:14 **TISI** [13] - 1:17, 5:20, 6:1, 6:5, 6:8, 7:14, 8:13, 9:22, 10:6, 10:15, 11:6, 12:24, 13:9 tit [1] - 12:16 **TITLE** [1] - 3:9 **TO** [2] - 3:9, 3:10 today [10] - 4:9, 9:4, 9:5, 12:18, 24:20, 26:17, 29:11, 32:10, 32:11, 38:18 today's [1] - 7:5 **Toiletry** [1] - 33:25 tort [1] - 28:15 total [1] - 14:19 touch [1] - 43:4 toward [1] - 21:5 **Toxicology** [1] - 35:24 **TRANSCRIPT** [2] - 1:4, 3:10 transcript [2] - 36:22, 44:8 TRANSCRIPTION [1] transferred [1] - 31:11 transmission [1] - 14:14 treated [1] - 25:22 **TRENTON** [1] - 1:8

trial [4] - 17:12, 17:15,

17:19, 18:14 trials [1] - 18:8 trickle [1] - 21:21 tried [4] - 7:5, 16:13, 17:18, 17:20 tries [1] - 33:18 trigger [1] - 20:21 triggered [1] - 20:17 true [2] - 18:1, 44:8 **try** [3] - 17:3, 23:14, 23:23 trying [5] - 10:10, 21:22, 25:10, 27:1, 38:14 **TUCKER** [1] - 2:13 turn [1] - 22:3 **two** [7] - 6:9, 7:1, 8:14, 9:7, 9:10, 22:25, 28:21

U

U.S [2] - 1:25, 3:17 **U.S.C** [1] - 3:9 ultimately [1] - 11:14 under [5] - 8:16, 9:13, 10:19, 30:16, 30:24 **Union** [1] - 2:14 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 **United** [2] - 35:23, 44:5 universe [1] - 28:2 unless [2] - 11:24, 11:25 **up** [15] - 8:24, 9:4, 9:5, 13:18, 14:7, 14:22, 17:10, 17:20, 20:20, 23:14, 26:20, 28:8, 29:20, 39:21, 43:4 usage [1] - 25:18 **USDJ** [1] - 1:10 **Utah** [1] - 41:19

٧

vacation [4] - 39:13, 40:1, 41:17, 41:21 valid [3] - 8:3, 9:19, 10:11 validly [1] - 8:6 van [1] - 41:20 variance [1] - 14:25 versus [1] - 21:18 VI [1] - 30:21 Vincent [2] - 44:5, 44:23 VINCENT [2] - 1:24, 3:17 VIRGINIA [1] - 1:15

W

wait [1] - 17:24 waiting [1] - 17:1 Walgreens [11] - 32:22, 32:23, 33:23, 34:21, 34:24, 35:15, 35:20, 36:1, 36:4, 36:13, 36:15 wants [2] - 36:19, 39:7 **WARREN** [1] - 1:18 **WASHINGTON** [2] - 2:7, 2:9 waste [2] - 36:20, 37:19 wasting [1] - 12:21 Wayne [1] - 42:16 wayside [1] - 5:5 **WEDINGER** [1] - 2:10 week [25] - 7:20, 9:24, 9:25, 39:6, 39:7, 39:8, 39:10, 39:14, 39:21, 40:6, 40:9, 40:22, 40:23, 41:5, 41:6, 41:9, 41:11, 42:3, 42:5, 42:6, 42:10, 42:14, 42:18 weeks [2] - 39:9, 40:1 **WILENTZ** [1] - 1:21 willing [1] - 7:12 window [1] - 37:9 witness [1] - 18:19 witnesses [12] - 6:4, 6:9, 6:14, 6:17, 6:22, 7:1, 7:3, 8:2, 8:14, 10:17, 10:18, 11:1 **WOLFSON** [79] - 1:10, 4:3, 4:15, 5:1, 5:8, 5:13, 6:2, 6:7, 7:11, 7:15, 9:12, 9:21, 10:4, 10:7, 11:3, 11:13, 12:16, 12:21, 12:25, 13:4, 13:12, 13:16, 14:5, 16:21, 19:3, 19:7, 20:7, 21:1, 21:16, 22:18, 24:4, 25:2, 25:10, 26:9, 27:8, 27:25, 28:17, 29:15, 29:20, 30:21, 31:21, 31:25, 32:4, 32:15, 32:20, 33:6, 33:8, 33:22, 35:12, 36:23, 37:5, 37:23, 38:5, 38:7, 38:13, 38:24, 39:6, 39:11, 39:18, 39:24, 40:2, 40:5, 40:8, 40:12, 40:14,

40:17, 41:2, 41:5, 41:10,

41:14, 41:21, 42:1, 42:6, 42:9, 42:13, 42:20, 42:23, 42:25, 43:9 wondering [1] - 41:1 word [1] - 27:20 words [1] - 25:19 worried [1] - 26:13 worry [1] - 38:7

Υ

year [2] - 8:19, 18:1 years [3] - 25:20, 28:21, 28:22 yesterday [1] - 22:8